



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that it must be destroyed? The scapegoat has already been alluded to and it is expressly said to carry away the sins of the people. But the scapegoat was not a sin-offering: its blood was not brought to the altar. If an offering at all it was an offering to Azazel who received it, blood and all, in his wilderness home. The regular sin-offerings were sacred, the flesh of some of them was eaten by the priests. It does not seem that this could have been done had they been infected by uncleanness. The Hebrew authorities themselves were not altogether clear in their own minds about the proper disposition of other sin-offerings, for we read of a dispute between Moses and Aaron on this point (Lev. 10:16-20). Had there been a clear tradition of demonic taboo passing into the flesh there could have been no such debate. We are naturally led to think that in the cases where the flesh was burned outside the camp this was because it was too sacred even to be eaten by the priests. In this case parallel with the Hindoo rite would again be obvious, for at the conclusion of that rite, as we have seen, the implements must be destroyed or deconsecrated. The central point in the sin-offering was the sprinkling of the blood. When this was accomplished the flesh which was left over must be destroyed, not because it was unclean, but because it was too sacred to be used in any way.

Enough has been said to show that the books before us deserve the careful attention of students.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH

MEADVILLE, PA.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

Mr. Cook's suggestive *Notes*¹ originally appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, and have grown out of critical studies upon II Samuel. Recognizing "that many of the older narratives that have gathered around the first king of Israel were not trustworthy, and that in their present form they are the result of certain processes of redaction," the author has endeavored to find definite indications of the various stages in the development of the traditions. Such effort inevitably involved a further analysis of older epochs.

Mr. Cook thinks the Davidic stories and those of Saul show points of contact with the Joshua cycle: so much so that he seems disposed to question the existence of such a person as Joshua, and to conclude that he is a sort of collated character—like the Greek tale of Sesostris in Egypt.

¹ *Critical Notes on Old Testament History*. By S. A. Cook. London and New York: Macmillan, 1907. xviii + 160 pages. 3s. 6d.

This is not definitely asserted, but the general trend of inquiry leads that way.

Mr. Cook concludes also that a twofold view of the origin of Israel is demonstrated in the older tradition: that in one Kadesh is the case, and the movement is into Judah from the south—the Calebite element is here to be considered. This southern tradition is to be called S. A second tradition is the dominance of an eastern movement, coming into central Palestine—to be called the C tradition. The Levites are made to be Calebite or Kenite.

Now neither of these traditions, nor both together, adequately account for some problems of the center and north. The recognition of the two lines of tradition is well: it should be supplemented by a consideration of the independent traditions of the Josephite clans, claiming descent from Egyptian priestly families and probably resident in Palestine where S and C entered. The threefold division of the Levitical clans is not adequately explained by Mr. Cook's suggestions; nor can this problem be considered independently of the "Levites" discovered in Arabian inscriptions. Mr. Cook merely stimulates inquiry—he rightly recognizes that he does not reach finality.

Some points appear well established: (1) that Kadesh, and not Sinai, is the scene of much early legislation; (2) that Geshur, Absalom's place of refuge, is at least as likely to be south Palestinian as Syrian; (3) that Absalom's revolt must have been at a much earlier period than is usually supposed, and was only a Judean movement; (4) that Judges, chap. 10, contains the misplaced preface to Saul's Ammonite war—though this does not require us to follow Mr. Cook in his "exceedingly bold" removal of all narratives between Judges, chap. 11 and I Sam., chap. 9; this introduction is considered an attempt to credit Samuel with the same achievement that an older tradition attributed to Saul; (5) Saul's activity in Gilead and his capital there, Mahanaim, make the stories of his Benjaminite origin and activities more than doubtful; the narratives as they stand are irreconcilable; (6) Saul's actual achievements and esteem in early Israel were much more than allowed him by late prophetic redactors.

It is not possible to present here the many questions raised by Mr. Cook. We think, however, that he should make more allowance for simple lacunae, or ellipsis. For instance, the conquest of Hazor by Joshua, the conquest of the same region by Danites, the later conquest of the same territory by David from Hadadezer, do not seem "plausible" to him, nor that the region should have at an early period become part of an Aramean state. This is very inconclusive. Assyrian and Egyptian royal inscriptions show that

Oriental monarchs are not given to recording their defeats; these have to be inferred between successive conquests of the same district. The primal difficulty in historical reconstruction of the periods Mr. Cook considers is found in the paucity of the data. However helpful the many questions propounded by the author, most students will feel that we are in sore need of further services of the spade and pickaxe in Palestine ere finally defining its historical outlines in detail. Mr. Cook has indicated pretty clearly the composite character of the Davidic stories, and some of the steps in the development of the traditions.

ALLAN H. GODBEY

MORRISVILLE, MO.

GREGORY'S INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

Introduction is here taken¹ in the broadest sense of the term. Three subjects are treated: the rise of the canon, the preservation of the text, and the character of the individual writings. The last of these topics is one to which chief attention is usually given in an "introduction," but this subject is here dismissed with less than 150 pages while about 400 pages have been given to the canon and about 250 to the text. Most readers will probably feel that this arrangement of material is unwise, but the reason for it is evident. The first two divisions of the book reproduce in the main the same author's *Canon and Text of the New Testament* which recently appeared in the "International Theological Library Series." To have discussed the additional topic at proportionate length would have doubled an already bulky volume.

As the *Canon and Text* was reviewed in this journal for April, 1908, the present review will deal chiefly with the supplementary matter in the new German edition. To the first part footnotes have been added giving quotations from the ancient authorities cited, and in the discussion of the text the author employs his new system of manuscript notation which he recently explained in his *Die Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1908). His method in brief is this. For 45 uncials already well known by letters, as Codex Sinaiticus designated by the Hebrew Aleph, the old notation is retained, and other uncials are indicated by numerals in heavy type, 046 to 0161. Fourteen papyrus fragments are designated P¹-14; for cursives ordinary numerals are used, 1 to 2304. Lectionaries are indicated by the letter l before numerals as l1-l1547.

¹ *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Von Caspar René Gregory. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909. vi+804 pages. M. 11.20.